



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,932	02/08/2002	Robert J. Nordstrom	23328-023002	1037
26211 7590 11/29/2008 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
ROY, BAISAKHI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3737				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/20/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,932

Applicant(s)

NORDSTROM ET AL.

Examiner

BAISAKHI ROY

Art Unit

3737

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24, 26, 27, 31-34, 36-38, 40-44, 46, 47 and 49-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24, 26, 27, 31-34, 36-38, 40-44, 46, 47 and 49-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-849)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, with respect to rejection of claims under Utzinger et al./Lin et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn. However, based on new guidelines for 101 practice, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 24, 26-34, 36, and 37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of copending Application No. 10/099,881. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in '881

directed to screening/classification of cervical tissue using fluorescence and reflectance data anticipates the method claims in current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 24, 26-34, 36, and 37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-48 of copending Application No. 10/418,415. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in '415 directed to screening/classification of cervical tissue using fluorescence and reflectance data anticipates the method claims in current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 24, 26-34, 36, and 37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of copending Application No. 10/295,794. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in '794 directed to screening/classification of cervical tissue using fluorescence and reflectance data anticipates the method claims in current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 24, 26-34, 36, and 37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46

of copending Application No. 10/418,922. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in '922 directed to screening/classification of cervical tissue using fluorescence and reflectance data anticipates the method claims in current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 24, 26-34, 36-38, 40-44, 46, 47, and 49-52 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of copending Application No. 10/530,741. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in '741 directed to screening/classification of cervical tissue using fluorescence and reflectance data anticipates the method claims in current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 24, 26, 27, 31-34, 36, 37, and 49-56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims are rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because these are method or process claims that do not transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing, nor are they tied to another statutory

class (such as a particular machine). See Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981) (quoting Benson, 409 U.S. at 70); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978) (citing Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). See also In re Comiskey, 499 F.3d 1365, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (request for rehearing *en banc* pending).

This new rejection is in view of the Interim Guidelines published on November 2005, incorporated into MPEP 2106 and views presented by the PTO on subject matter eligibility of process claims to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *In re Bilski*, Appeal No. 2007-1130. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a § 101 process must be tied to another statutory class (such as an apparatus) and must positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Therefore claims must positively recite the apparatus elements necessary to carry out the method steps and must also positively include the subject matter this is being transformed to a different state or the end result being accomplished.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BAISAKHI ROY whose telephone number is (571)272-7139. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 a.m. - 4p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRIAN CASLER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3737

BR
/B. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 3737